Remarks/Arguments

A. Status of the Claims

Claim 22 is revised to include the subject matter of claim 40, which has been cancelled. Applicant requests that this amendment be made of record, as it reduces the issues for appeal and also places this case into a condition for allowance (see below). *See* 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b).

This leaves claims 22-24, 28-39, 42-43, and 47-49 as pending.

B. Telephone Interview

Examiner Rabon Sergent and Applicant's representative, Michael Krawzsenek, discussed the Final Office Action *via* telephone on January 14, 2010. In particular, the use of the term "poly(thio)urethane/urea" in the preamble of claim 22 and the subject matter of claim 40 were discussed. Examiner Sergent indicated that if "poly(thio)urethane/urea" was replaced with "polythiourethane/urea" in the preamble and if the subject matter of claim 40 was introduced into claim 22, then the written description rejection would be withdrawn and no further indefiniteness rejection would be presented.

C. Written Description Rejection Is Moot

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the current written description rejection, in an effort to further prosecution the preamble to claim 22 is revised by replacing "poly(thio)urethane/urea" with "polythiourethane/urea." This renders the written description rejection moot. Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

D. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present document is a complete response to the Final Office Action mailed November 16, 2009. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (512) 536-3020 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael R. Krawzsenek

Reg. No. 51,898

Attorney for Applicants

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. 600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2400 Austin, Texas 78701 512.536.3020 (voice) 512.536.4598 (fax)

Date: February 15, 2010